

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 11, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 11, 2008. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 9-13 and 25-29 are pending in the application. Claims 9-13, 25-31 are pending following entry of this response. Claims 9 and 25 have been amended. New claims 30 and 31 have been added to recite aspects of the invention. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

Interview Summary

On March 11, 2008, a telephonic interview was held between Jon Stewart, attorney for Applicant, and Examiner Pham. The parties discussed the cited references including the *Gupta* and *Glass* references. Claims 9, 10, 13, 25, 30, and 31 were discussed. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that the cited portion of *Gupta* did disclose at least the limitations recited in claim 10. The Examiner also stated that further consideration is needed with respect to claims 9, 13, 25, 30, and 31.

Claim Objections

Claim 9 is objected to because the Examiner suggests that the use of the term "should be" is unclear. The examiner makes a similar objection to claim 25. Claims 9 and 25 have been amended to address the issue raised by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-13 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7051275 by *Gupta et al.* (hereafter *Gupta*), and further in view of U.S. Provisional Application 60/481003 by *Glass* filed June 20, 2003. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143. The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criteria.

Applicants submit, at a minimum, that *Gupta* in view of *Glass* does not disclose a “method for managing annotations for multiple versions of documents that includes “selecting one or more annotation versioning policies dictating how annotations made for a current version of a document are applied to a subsequent version of the document, wherein the subsequent version of the document includes one or more revisions to the substantive content of the current version of the document.”

Glass discloses a system that provides a structure for the method by which documents are annotated (see paragraph [0063] of *Glass*). Specifically, the system relates to software applications that provide a method of assisting a human operator in viewing and recording judgments about the contents of electronic documents (see paragraph [0003] of *Glass*).

Gupta discloses a system used to manage “multiple different versions of the same multimedia content” (see *Gupta*, Abstract). Specifically, *Gupta* discloses a system for maintaining annotations corresponding to multimedia content (see column 2, lines 50-53 of *Gupta*). As described in column 2, lines 14-20 of *Gupta*, multimedia presentations available to a user may include different versions of the same underlying multimedia content. Such versions may include, for example, different resolutions or different bandwidth requirements. The system contemplated by *Gupta* makes an annotation made for one version of a multimedia presentation available to the other versions of the multimedia presentation while maintaining only one copy of the annotation at an annotation server (see column 2, lines 55-59 of *Gupta*). In each case,

however, the different versions provide “the same multimedia content.” In this manner, an annotation made, for example, for a high-resolution version of the multimedia presentation is available for a low-resolutions version of the same multimedia presentation (see column 3, lines 56-57 of *Gupta*).

By contrast, amended claim 9 recites the limitation of “selecting one or more annotation versioning policies dictating how annotations made for a current version of a document are applied to a subsequent version of the document, wherein the subsequent version of the document includes one or more revisions to the substantive content of the current version of the document.” Neither *Gupta* nor *Glass* teach or suggest these limitations.

As described above, multimedia presentations referred to as the “different versions” in *Gupta* refer to different formats of the same underlying multimedia content. For example, a high-resolution and a low-resolution versions of a video only differ by the resolution with which the video is presented, while the substantive content of the two versions remains the same. In other words, the definition of the different versions of a document presented by *Gupta* implies that the substantive content of the document is not modified in any way. This is far different than the definition recited in amended claim 9, which now clearly states that the subsequent version of the document includes one or more revisions to the substantive content of the current version of the document.

As the foregoing illustrates, *Gupta* and *Glass* do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 9. Therefore, no combination of the cited references can render amended claim 9 obvious. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 9 is allowable and request allowance of the claim. Claims 10-13, 30, and 31 depend from allowable amended claim 9 and, therefore, are also in condition for allowance.

In addition, claim 13 dependent from claim 9 further recites that at least one of the annotation versioning policies dictates that an authorized user must validate an annotation created for a current version of a document before the annotation is applied

to subsequent versions of the document. The Examiner suggests that column 13, lines 21-24 of *Gupta* teach these limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The cited portion of *Gupta* teaches that, when a user is making an annotation to a segment of a media presentation, a media server may be configured to stream the segment for presentation to the user. By reviewing the streamed segment, the user may verify the portion of the media stream to which his or her annotation will correspond. Verifying the portion of the current document where the annotation should be made is simply not the same as validating, by an authorized user, an annotation made to the current version of the document before applying the annotation to subsequent versions of the document, recited in claim 13. In particular, as demonstrated above, *Gupta* discloses multiple multimedia presentation formats for the same underlying multimedia content, where claim 13 specifies that a user validates whether an annotation applied to a current version of a document is also applied to a subsequent (i.e., modified) version of that document. In the passage cited by the Examiner, there is simply no “current” and “subsequent” version. Instead, there is only the portion of the multimedia presentation being annotated. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that the Examiner is trying to modify the system of *Gupta* in a way that is derived only from the plain language of the pending claims. Furthermore, *Glass* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Gupta*. Therefore, no combination of the cited references renders claim 13 obvious. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is allowable and request allowance of the claim.

New claim 30 is also dependent on claim 9, and further recites that at least one of the annotation versioning policies dictates that an annotation created for a current version of a document and applied to a subsequent version of the document includes a marker indicating that the annotation in the subsequent version of the document is unvalidated. New claim 31 is dependent on claim 30, and recites that the marker is included in the annotation in the subsequent version of the document until an authorized user validates the annotation created for the current version of the document. Support for these limitations can be found in paragraph [0049] of the present application. Neither *Gupta* nor *Glass* teaches or suggests these limitations. Therefore, claims 30

and 31 are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 25 has been amended to recite the limitations similar to those added to amended claim 9. Therefore, no combination of the recited references can render this claim obvious either. Thus, claim 25 is in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as amended claim 9.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner seems to confuse a set of available annotation policies recited in amended claim 25 with an annotation set described in *Gupta*. As is recited in amended claim 25, the set of available annotation policies dictate how an annotation created for a current version of the document are applied to one or more subsequent versions of the document. Amended claim 25 further recites that an interface is provided for allowing a user to select one or more of the available annotation policies to be applied to the annotation. The Examiner relies on column 13, lines 25-30 of *Gupta* for teaching the latter limitation. However, consistent with the remainder of the disclosure of *Gupta*, the annotation set disclosed in the cited portion refers to a set of different versions of an underlying multimedia presentation, i.e., to a set of presentations which each contain the same underlying content, for which the annotations may be made, not to the actual annotation policies used to annotate the versions of the multimedia presentation. Consistent with this interpretation of the annotation set, the dialog box 260 disclosed in the cited portion of *Gupta* allows the user to identify a set to which the new annotation will belong.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner misapplies *Gupta* to suggest that *Gupta* teaches providing an interface allowing a user to select one or more of the available annotation policies to be applied to the annotation, recited in amended claim 25. Since *Glass* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Gupta*, no combination of the cited references can render amended claim 25 obvious. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 25 is allowable and request allowance of the claim. Claims 26-29 depend from allowable amended claim 25 and, therefore, are also in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)